

Spectral properties of Luther-Emery systems

Johannes Voit

*Bayreuther Institut für Makromolekülforschung (BIMF) and
Theoretische Physik 1, Universität Bayreuth, D-95440 Bayreuth (Germany)*

(February 6, 2008)

Abstract

We calculate the spectral function of the Luther-Emery model which describes one-dimensional fermions with gapless charge and gapped spin degrees of freedom. We find a true singularity with interaction dependent exponents on the gapped spin dispersion and a finite maximum depending on the magnitude of the spin gap, on a shifted charge dispersion. We apply these results to photoemission experiments on charge density wave systems and discuss the spectral properties of a one-dimensional Mott insulator.

PACS numbers: 71.27.+a, 71.30.+h, 71.45.Lr, 79.60.-i

Typeset using REVTeX

Non-Fermi liquid behavior in correlated fermion systems is an exciting topic of current research. One-dimensional (1D) metals are a paradigmatic example of non-Fermi liquids: their low-energy excitations are not quasi-particles but rather collective charge and spin density fluctuations which obey each to their proper dynamics [1]. The key features of these “Luttinger liquids” [2] clearly show up in the single-particle spectral function

$$\rho(q, \omega) = -\pi^{-1} \text{Im } G(k_F + q, \mu + \omega) \quad (1)$$

which can be measured in a photoemission experiment: (i) absence of fermionic quasi-particles, (ii) anomalous dimensions of operators producing correlation functions with non-universal power-laws, (iii) charge-spin separation [3]. [In Eq. (1), G is the electronic Green’s function, k_F the Fermi wave number, and μ the chemical potential.] Responsible is the electron-electron interaction which is marginal in one dimension and therefore transfers nonvanishing momentum in scattering processes at all energy scales, and the nesting properties of the 1D Fermi surface which allow for the emergence of Peierls $2k_F$ charge and spin density fluctuations which then interfere with Cooper-type superconducting fluctuations.

In a Luttinger liquid, both the charge and the spin excitations are gapless. There are, however, other possibilities for interacting 1D fermions: when backscattering of electrons with momentum transfer $\pm 2k_F$ becomes relevant (often a consequence of electron-phonon coupling), a gap in the spin excitation spectrum opens, while for commensurate band fillings, Umklapp process may create a charge gap. The other degree of freedom would remain gapless. Systems in these classes would be dominated by singlet superconducting (SS) [5] or charge density wave (CDW) correlations [6,7] or be 1D Mott insulators [8,9] – problems of high experimental and theoretical interest. While there is a rather complete picture of the properties of Luttinger liquids [1], much less is known for systems with both gapless and gapped degrees of freedom. This is particularly true for dynamical correlation functions such as the spectral function, Eq. (1), which give direct information on the nature and dynamics of the elementary excitations. There is a general belief that the opening of a gap affects the system for frequencies smaller than this gap while the behavior of the ungapped system is essentially recovered at larger frequency scales. It is the purpose of this Letter to discuss the spectral function of a model with gapless and gapped degrees of freedom, to compare to the above “naive” prediction, and to comment on recent photoemission experiments on quasi-1D CDW systems where this model could be relevant.

The generic model describing this situation

$$H = H_0^{(\rho)} + H_0^{(\sigma)} + H_{1\perp}^{(\sigma)} \quad (2)$$

$$H_0^{(\nu)} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\nu=\rho,\sigma} \int dx \left\{ v_\nu K_\nu \pi^2 \Pi_\nu^2(x) + \frac{v_\nu}{K_\nu} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi_\nu(x)}{\partial x} \right)^2 \right\} \quad , \quad (3)$$

$$H_{1\perp} = \frac{2g_{1\perp}}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int dx \cos [\sqrt{8}\Phi_\sigma(x)] \quad (4)$$

has been solved by Luther and Emery [4]. Here, H_0 describes harmonic charge ($\nu = \rho$) and spin ($\nu = \sigma$) density fluctuations through the bosonic phase fields $\Phi_\nu(x)$ and their canonically conjugate momenta $\Pi_\nu(x)$. Their dispersions are gapless $\omega_\nu(q) = v_\nu|q|$ with velocities v_ν , and H_0 contains, in addition, stiffness constants K_ν . The backscattering Hamiltonian $H_{1\perp}$

is, for $K_\sigma - 1$ small enough compared to $|g_{1\perp}|$, a relevant perturbation and opens a gap Δ_σ in the spin excitation spectrum. The Umklapp Hamiltonian for a half-filled band is obtained by simply replacing spin by charge in Eq. (4). Luther and Emery have shown that for the special value $K_\sigma = 1/2$, the interaction Hamiltonian (4) can be represented as a bilinear in spinless fermions, and diagonalized. The resulting spectrum $\varepsilon_\sigma(q) = \pm\sqrt{v_\sigma^2 q^2 + \Delta_\sigma^2}$ shows a gap Δ_σ at the Fermi level. The possibility of exactly calculating correlation functions for this model is severely limited by the absence of any practical relation between the physical fermions and the spinless pseudofermions emerging from the Luther-Emery solution [10]. Many problems map onto this model at low energies.

Here, I compute the single-particle spectral function $\rho(q, \omega)$, Eq. (1), for the Luther-Emery model. Other correlation functions may be obtained along the same lines but less experiments are available that one could possibly compare to. The charge-spin separation manifest in the Hamiltonian (2) allows to represent $\rho(q, \omega)$ as a convolution

$$\rho(q, \omega) = (2\pi)^{-2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq' d\omega' [g_\rho(q', \omega') g_\sigma(q - q', \omega - \omega') + (q \rightarrow -q, \omega \rightarrow -\omega)] \quad (5)$$

of certain charge and spin correlation functions

$$g_\nu(x, t) = \langle \Psi_{rx}^{(\nu)}(xt) \Psi_{rs}^{(\nu)\dagger}(00) \rangle. \quad (6)$$

The notation $\Psi^{(\nu)}$ indicates that only the ν -part of the boson representation of Ψ is to be taken. The charge part is easy (we only display the leading ω - and q -dependence)

$$g_\rho(q, \omega) \sim \Theta(\omega - v_\rho q) \Theta(\omega + v_\rho q) (\omega - v_\rho q)^{\gamma_\rho - 1} (\omega + v_\rho q)^{\gamma_\rho - 1/2} \quad (K_\rho \neq 1) \quad (7)$$

$$\sim \frac{\Theta(\omega + v_\rho q)}{\sqrt{\omega + v_\rho q}} \delta(\omega - v_\rho q) \quad (K_\rho = 1). \quad (8)$$

Using a similar expression for the spins, one can reproduce in detail the spectral functions of the Luttinger model calculated elsewhere directly [3]. Notice that the divergences are stronger than for a spinless Luttinger model ensuring that singularities remain after performing the convolution integrals.

The determination of the spin correlation function is more involved because it has no simple representation in terms of the Luther-Emery pseudofermions. In real space, I take

$$g_\sigma(x, t) \sim \exp \left(-\Delta_\sigma \sqrt{x^2 - v_\sigma^2 t^2} / v_\sigma \right) / \sqrt{\alpha + i(v_\sigma t - x)}. \quad (9)$$

This form (i) reduces to the correct Luttinger form for vanishing gap. (ii) From the equivalence of the Luther-Emery model to a classical 2D Coulomb gas, and Debye screening of the charges above the Kosterlitz-Thouless temperature, one deduces the exponential factor [11]. (iii) Gulácsi has calculated explicitly the $t = 0$ -Green function of a 1D Mott insulator [12]: the form (9) is obtained from his results by Lorentz-transforming the exponential term as in a massive Dirac theory; the power-law prefactor would correspond to a massless theory which is expected to govern the short space/time ($|x|, v_\sigma |t| \ll v_\sigma / \Delta_\sigma$) behavior. Fourier transformation then gives

$$g_\sigma(q, \omega) \sim \left(1 + \frac{v_\sigma q}{\sqrt{v_\sigma^2 q^2 + \Delta_\sigma^2}}\right) \frac{\Theta(\omega + v_\sigma q)}{\sqrt{\omega + v_\sigma q}} \delta(\omega - \sqrt{v_\sigma^2 q^2 + \Delta_\sigma^2}) \quad (10)$$

This result can then be inserted into the convolution formula (5) and evaluated.

What could we expect from our knowledge of the Luttinger liquid [3]? There the singularities at $\omega = v_{\rho(\sigma)}q$ arise from processes where the charge (spin) contributes all of the electrons' momentum q and the spin (charge) none. The same argument applied to the Luther-Emery model predicts singularities at the renormalized spin dispersion $\varepsilon_\sigma(q)$ and at a shifted charge dispersion $\varepsilon_\rho(q) = v_\rho q + \Delta_\sigma$ (inset in Fig. 1). The result of the calculation is shown schematically in Fig. 1 for $q > 0$ and the (realistic) case $v_\rho > v_\sigma$. There are indeed features at these frequencies. At $\varepsilon_\sigma(q)$, there is a true singularity $[\omega - \varepsilon_\sigma(q)]^{\alpha-1/2}$ as in the Luttinger model (however, here α is *defined* as $\alpha = (K_\rho + K_\rho^{-1} - 2)/4$ since the notion of a K_σ does not make sense). Folklore would predict another singularity $|\omega - \varepsilon_\rho(q)|^{(\alpha-1)/2}$ (dashed lines in Fig. 2) which is *not* observed here. It is cut off instead to a finite maximum of order $\Delta_\sigma^{(\alpha-1)/2}$: As in the 1D quantum antiferromagnet, the opening of the spin gap cuts off the singularity of the prefactor of the delta function in the spin-equivalent to Eq. (8) as $q \rightarrow 0$. *The spin gap therefore suppresses the divergence associated with the charge dispersion while on the renormalized spin dispersion, the spectral response remains singular.*

At negative frequencies, the Luther-Emery model has pronounced shadow bands. Here, the Luttinger liquid only has very small weight. The weight in the Luther-Emery model is much stronger here, and the spectral function has the same overall shape as at positive frequencies. For $q > 0$, the positive frequency part is enhanced by a coherence factor $1 + v_\sigma q / \varepsilon_\sigma(q)$ while a factor $1 - v_\sigma q / \varepsilon_\sigma(q)$ decreases its shadow. These factors translate the increased coherence due to the spin pairing.

Can we expect structured spectral functions for α larger than 1/2 or 1? The present calculation which amounts to determining the leading behavior does not allow a definite answer. Specifically, we have been generous on details of cutoff procedures and therefore do not fulfill the sum rules. Experience with the Luttinger model shows, however, that once all sum rules are enforced, when the exponents increase so as to change a divergence into a cusp singularity the prefactor changes sign so as to turn upward the cusps [13]. Such a crossover, keeping peaky structures also for large α , is natural and is expected to occur in the present problem, too.

Notice finally that the behavior of $\rho(q, \omega \approx \pm \Delta_\sigma)$ is determined by that of the spin part close to Δ_σ and the charge part at $\omega \approx 0$. It is therefore *not* necessary to know details of the charge dynamics on a scale $\omega \approx \Delta_\sigma$ where the Luttinger description may have acquired significant corrections.

The k -integrated density of states then is $N(\omega) \sim \Theta(\omega - |\Delta_\sigma|)(\omega - |\Delta_\sigma|)^\alpha$ with α given above. There is no weight below the gap, and the typical gap singularity in the density of states of the spin fluctuations is wiped out by the gapless charges.

The spectral function of a 1D Mott insulator can be computed similarly ($\sigma \leftrightarrow \rho$ everywhere). Spin-rotation invariance, however, requires $K_\sigma = 1$, and Eq. (8) must be used for the spin part. Then $\rho(q, \omega) \propto \Theta(\omega - \sqrt{v_\rho^2 q^2 + \Delta_\rho^2}) / \sqrt{\omega - \sqrt{v_\rho^2 q^2 + \Delta_\rho^2}}$, a consequence of the convolution of two delta functions now. Continuity then suggests that as the Mott transition is approached by varying the band-filling, spectral weight is gradually taken out of both the

charge and spin divergences of the Luttinger liquid parts of the spectral function to reappear in the Luther-Emery function possessing only a charge divergence, although the transition leaves the spins unaffected and opens only a charge gap. $N(\omega) \sim \Theta(\omega - \varepsilon_\rho)$ here.

A wide variety of models fall into the Luther-Emery universality class and the present results should be applicable there in a low-energy sector: Luttinger liquids coupled to phonons and related models so long as they are incommensurate, have wide regions of parameter space with gapped spin fluctuations [5]; the negative- U Hubbard model at any band-filling has a spin gap [14], and the positive- U Hubbard model at half-filling has a charge gap [8,9]; spin gaps occur frequently in models of two coupled Luttinger or Hubbard chains [15,16], etc. Some numerical studies have attempted to calculate spectral properties [9,16]. While consistent with the present work on the existence of shadow bands, their resolution is not good enough to probe the finer structures computed here.

Importantly, these results could prove useful in the description of the photoemission properties of certain quasi-1D materials. There is by now a considerable number of such experiments on quasi-1D conductors in their “normal” metallic state (above low-temperature phase transitions) [6,7,17]. Usually, they measure the density of states $N(\omega)$, which universally show an absence of spectral weight at the Fermi edge, and a gradual raise with energy only over a considerable fraction of the conduction band width, these two features being essentially temperature-independent. This behavior is formally consistent with the Luttinger liquid picture, predicting $N(\omega) \propto |\omega|^\alpha$ with some interaction-dependent exponent $\alpha > 0$. More strikingly even, an angle-resolved photoemission experiment on $K_{0.3}MoO_3$ shows *two* dispersing peaks [17]. While some materials such as the Bechgaard salts, may well fall into this universality class [18], it is particularly surprising that CDW systems such as the blue bronze $K_{0.3}MoO_3$, or $(TaSe_4)_2I$ should behave similarly. In fact, the photoemission properties are in striking contrast to the established picture of a fluctuating Peierls insulator [19]. It predicts a strongly temperature dependent, narrow $[|\omega| \leq \Delta_{CDW}(T=0)]$ pseudogap and $\rho(q > 0, \omega)$ is governed by a broadened quasi-particle peak at $\omega > 0$ and a weak shadow at $\omega < 0$.

A Luttinger liquid interpretation for the CDW photoemission is highly suggestive but encounters problems which are all resolved in a Luther-Emery framework. (i) Luttinger liquids have no dominant $2k_F$ -CDW correlations: for repulsive interactions ($K_\rho < 1$), spin density waves are logarithmically stronger than CDWs, and for attractive interactions, the system is dominated by superconductivity [1]. A spin gap is a necessary condition for dominant CDW correlations in 1D and realized in the Luther-Emery model! (ii) $2k_F$ -CDWs often are due to electron-phonon coupling, and renormalization group provides us with a detailed scenario [1,5]. In Fig. 2, we summarize the dependence of this spin gap on electron-phonon coupling λ , the phonon frequency ω_D , and K_ρ , as calculated from earlier results [5]. A spin gap also opens if CDWs are caused by Coulomb interaction between chains [20]. (iii) The spin susceptibility of CDW systems decreases with decreasing temperature indicative of activated spin fluctuations. (iv) For a Luttinger model, the stronger divergence in $\rho(q, \omega)$ is associated with the charge mode. For repulsive interactions, $v_\rho > v_\sigma$ while in the experiment on $K_{0.3}MoO_3$, the quickly dispersing signal is less peaked than the slow one. On the other hand, the important feature of the Luther-Emery spectral function, Fig. 1, is that the spin gap suppresses the divergence of the charge signal which disperses more quickly than the divergent spin contribution. The Luther-Emery spectral function is consistent with

the experiments and this model therefore might be a natural starting point for a description of the low-energy physics of CDW materials such as $K_{0.3}MoO_3$.

Obviously, this suggestion is somewhat speculative and independent support is called for. Its virtue is that it comes to grips with the puzzle that the spin susceptibility of $K_{0.3}MoO_3$ decreases with decreasing temperature while the conductivity is metallic, that it leaves space for the good description of optical properties as a fluctuating Peierls insulator (they only probe the charge fluctuations which will form CDW precursors at temperatures much below the spin gap opening, presumably as a consequence of emerging 3D coherence), and that it provides an (admittedly phenomenological) description of the photoemission properties of this material with extremely 1D *electronic* properties [21]. As in the Bechgaard salts [18], a single-particle exponent $\alpha \sim 1$ would be required implying strong long-range electron-electron interactions, and there is at best preliminary support from transport measurements, for such strong correlations in $K_{0.3}MoO_3$. Retarded electron-phonon coupling could increase α over its purely electronic value [5]. To what extent this mechanism contributes can be gauged from the measured α which must be larger than the one derived from the enhancement of v_ρ over the band velocity (hélas strongly depending on the accuracy of band structure calculations). In the perspective of the present work, high-resolution photoemission studies on the organic conductor TTF-TCNQ are desirable because there is independent evidence both for strong electronic correlations and electron-phonon coupling, and a crossover between regimes dominated by one or the other seems to take place as the temperature is varied.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge fruitful discussions with J. W. Allen, W. Brenig, R. Claessen, M. Grioni, M. Gulácsi, G.-H. Gweon, D. Malterre, and J.-P. Pouget. This research was supported by DFG under SFB 279-B4.

REFERENCES

- [1] For a recent review see J. Voit, Rep. Prog. Phys. **58**, 977 (1995).
- [2] F. D. M. Haldane, J. Phys. C **14**, 2585 (1981).
- [3] J. Voit, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 6740 (1993); V. Meden and K. Schönhammer, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 15752 (1992).
- [4] A. Luther and V. J. Emery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 589 (1974); P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **34**, 1247 (1975).
- [5] G. T. Zimanyi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2089 (1988); J. Voit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 323 (1990); J. Voit and H. J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 10068 (1988).
- [6] J.-Y. Veuillen *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **3**, 355 (1987).
- [7] B. Dardel, D. Malterre, M. Grioni, P. Weibel, Y. Baer, and F. Lévy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3144 (1991).
- [8] E. H. Lieb and F. Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20**, 1445 (1968).
- [9] R. Preuss *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 732 (1994).
- [10] An exception is the $4k_F$ -component of the density-density correlation function which has been evaluated by M. Mori *et al.*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63**, 1639 (1994).
- [11] S.-T. Chui and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 315 (1975).
- [12] M. Gulácsi (unpublished).
- [13] J. Voit in *The Hubbard Model*, ed. by D. Baeriswyl *et al.*, Plenum, New York (1995), p.263.
- [14] T. B. Bahder and F. Woynarovich, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 2114 (1986).
- [15] R. M. Noack *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 882 (1994); N. Nagaosa and M. Oshikawa, cond-mat/9412003; H. J. Schulz, cond-mat/9412098; L. Balents and M. P. A. Fisher, cond-mat/9503045.
- [16] H. Tsunetsugu, M. Troyer, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 16078 (1994).
- [17] G.-H. Gweon *et al.*, unpublished.
- [18] B. Dardel *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **24**, 687 (1993).
- [19] P. A. Lee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 462 (1973); R. H. McKenzie and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1085 (1992).
- [20] L. P. Gor'kov and I. E. Dzyaloshinskiĭ, Sov. Phys. JETP **40**, 198 (1975); P. A. Lee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **15**, 2984, (1977); H. J. Schulz, J. Phys. C **16**, 6769 (1983); P. Kopietz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2997 (1995).
- [21] J.-P. Pouget, to be published in the Proceedings of the NATO-ASI *Physics and Chemistry of Low-Dimensional Inorganic Conductors*, Les Houches, 1995.

FIGURES

FIG. 1 Spectral function of the Luther-Emery model for $q > 0$. The thick dashed line at $\varepsilon_\rho(k)$ gives the Luttinger liquid divergence which is suppressed here. The inset shows the dispersion of the two $\omega > 0$ -features.

FIG. 2 Schematic dependence of the spin gap in a Luttinger liquid coupled to phonons on phonon frequency for various electron-electron interactions K_ρ and fixed electron-phonon coupling λ .



